arXiv:1403.1986v4 [math-ph] 31 May 2015

Absorbing-state phase transition in biased activated random walk

Lorenzo Taggi
Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences

June 2, 2015

Abstract

We consider the activated random walk (ARW) model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, which undergoes a transition from an absorbing regime to a regime of sustained activity. In any dimension we prove that the system is in the active regime when the particle density is less than one, provided that the jump distribution is biased and that the sleeping rate is small enough. This answers a question from *Rolla and Sidoravicius* (2012) and *Dickman, Rolla and Sidoravicius* (2010) in the case of biased jump distribution. Furthermore, in one dimension we provide a new lower bound for the critical density as a function of the jump distribution and we prove that the critical density depends on the jump distribution.

Introduction

Interacting particle systems are favourable models to study non-equilibrium phenomena, as they provide a simple example of phase transitions in systems maintained far from equilibrium. In this paper we consider the activated random walk (ARW) model on the lattice. This is a continuous-time interacting particle system with conserved number of particles, where each particle can be in one of two states: A (active) or S (inactive, sleeping). Each A-particle performs an independent, continuous time random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with jump rate 1 and jump distribution $p(\cdot)$. Moreover, every A-particle has a Poisson clock with rate $\lambda > 0$ (*sleeping rate*). When the clock rings, if the particle does not share the site with other particles, the transition $A \to S$ occurs, otherwise nothing happens. S-particles do not move and remain sleeping until the instant when an other particle is present at the same vertex. At such an instant, the particle which is in the S-state flips to the A-state, giving the transition A+S $\to$ 2A. The initial particle configuration is distributed according to a product of identical distributions. Such distributions depend on a free parameter μ, which equals the expected number of particles per site (*particle density*). As we consider initial configurations with only active particles, from the previous rules it follows that sleeping particles can be observed only if they occupy the site alone.

In ARW a phase transition arises from a conflict between the spread of the activity and a tendency of the activity to die out. We say that ARW exhibits *local fixation* if for any finite set $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, there exists a finite time t_V such that after this time the set V contains no active particles. We say that ARW *stays active* if local fixation does not occur. In this article we study the dependence of the transition point between the two phases on the parameters of the model, i.e., the initial particle distribution, the sleeping rate, and the jump distribution.



Figure 1: Lower bound $B(q, \lambda)$ for the critical density for low lambda ($\lambda = 1/1000$) as a function of the bias parameter q (continuous line), contrasted with the lower bound $\lambda/(1+\lambda)$ from [7] (dashed horizontal line).

We fix an initial particle distribution and we consider as a free parameter the particle density. In order to characterize such a transition point, we introduce the *critical density*

$$\mu_c := \inf \{\mu \in (0, \infty) : \text{ probability ARW is active } > 0\}$$

and we study its dependence on the other parameters. The 0-1 law and the monotonicity properties proved in [7] imply that if $\mu > \mu_c$, then ARW sustains activity *almost surely*, provided that the initial particle distribution is distributed as a product of distributions that are stochastically increasing with μ (e.g. Poisson, Bernoulli).

In several works an analytical estimation of such a transition point has been provided under different assumptions. In the special case of totally asymmetric jumps on the nearest neighbour, i. e. $p(1) = 1$ or $p(-1) = 1$, it is known that $\mu_c = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ [6]. In the case of one dimension and general jump distribution on nearest neighbours, it is known that $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \leq \mu_c \leq 1$ [7]. It is not clear from these results whether the critical density depends on the jump distribution. The authors of [7] claim that their lower bound $\mu_c \geq \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ is sharp, as it should be contrasted with the totally asymmetric case $\mu_c = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. In this article, we show that such a lower bound is not sharp for any jump distribution, as we prove that the critical density (significantly) depends on the jump distribution. The proof is based on a refinement of the method that has been employed by Rolla and Sidoravicius in [7]. In particular, we consider the case of jumps on nearest neighbours on the graph $\mathbb{Z}$ and we introduce a *bias parameter* $q \in [0, 1]$, which equals the probability of jumping to the right nearest neighbour, i.e., $p(1) = q$, $p(-1) = 1 - q$. We provide a lower bound for the critical density as a function of the sleeping rate and of the bias parameter (see Figure 1). As we prove that the critical density is strictly larger than $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ when $q \notin \{0, 1\}$, it follows that the critical density is not just a function of the sleeping rate, but of the jump distribution as well. This means that the bias of the jump distribution does not simply provide a direction to the system, as one might expect, but it affects in a non-trivial way the long-time behaviour of the process. Our results suggest that the bias increases the activity in the system monotonically, namely that the critical density is increasing with respect to q in $[0, 1/2)$ and decreasing in $[1/2, 1)$.

Regarding the active phase, it is known in any dimension that if $\mu > 1$, then ARW stays active for any value of λ and for any jump distribution [5, 7, 8]. Indeed, it is natural to expect

that if $\mu > 1$, then the system sustains activity, as on average there is not enough space for all the A-particles to turn to the S-state. In [3] and [7], Dickman, Rolla and Sidoravicius ask whether the system sustains activity when the particle density is less than one. Our main result is providing a positive answer to this question in the case of biased jump distribution. Hence, even though on average there is enough place for active particles to turn to the S-state, the particle motion prevents the system from fixating. In particular, in one dimension we prove a stronger statement, i.e., the system sustains activity even when the particle density is arbitrarily small, provided that the sleeping rate is small enough. We believe that our methods can be generalized to address the same question in the case of activated random walk with symmetric jump distribution on graphs where the random walk has a positive speed (e.g. regular tree). However, novel ideas are needed to address the same question on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and symmetric jump distribution.

We end this introductory section by presenting the structure of the article. In Section 1 we define rigorously the model and we state our results. In Section 2 we introduce the proofs to the reader. In Section 3 we present the Diaconis-Fulton graphical representation, which is a fundamental framework for the analysis of ARW. In Section 4 we prove our lower bound for the critical density. In Section 5 we prove our upper bound for the critical density in one dimension. In Section 6 we prove our upper bound in more than two dimensions.

1 Definition and results

The state of the ARW at time $t \geq 0$ is represented by a realization $\eta_t \in {\mathbb{N}_{0\rho}}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, where $\mathbb{N}_{0\rho} = \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\rho\}$. At any site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\eta_t(x) = \rho$ if the site x is occupied by one sleeping particle and $\eta_t(x) = k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ if it is occupied by k active particles. We define an order relation for ρ, setting $0 < \rho < 1 < 2 \ldots$. We also let $|\rho| = 1$, so that $|\eta_t(x)|$ counts the number of particles regardless of their state. The addition is defined by $\rho + 0 = \rho$, and $\rho + k = k + 1$ if $k \geq 1$, providing the $A + S \to 2A$ transition. The $A \to S$ transition is represented by $\rho \cdot k$, where $\rho \cdot 1 = \rho$ and $\rho \cdot k = k$ if $k \geq 2$. We define the operator $[\,\cdot\,]^*$, which counts the number of active particles, i.e., $[\eta_t(x)]^* = \eta_t(x)$ if $\eta_t(x) \geq 1$ or $[\eta_t(x)]^* = 0$ otherwise.

We introduce two operators, "move" and "sleep", which act on the particle configuration. For each site x, we have the transitions $\eta \to \tau_{xy}\eta$ at rate $[\eta_t(x)]^*\, p(y-x)$, where the configuration $\tau_{xy}\eta \in \mathbb{N}_{0\rho}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is defined as,

$$\tau_{xy}\eta(z) = \begin{cases} \eta(z) + 1 & \text{if } z = y, \\ \eta(z) - 1 & \text{if } z = x, \\ \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x \text{ and } z \neq y, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

and the transition $\eta \to \tau_{x\rho}\eta$ at rate $\lambda\,[\eta_t(x)]^*$, where the configuration $\tau_{x\rho}\eta \in \mathbb{N}_{0\rho}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is defined as,

$$\tau_{x\rho}\eta(z) = \begin{cases} \eta(z) \cdot \rho & \text{if } z = x, \\ \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The initial configuration η_0 is distributed according to the probability distribution ν^μ, which is a product of identical distributions. Such distributions depend on a free parameter $\mu \in (0, \infty)$, which equals the expected number of particles per site. From now on, we will represent the

superscript of μ only if necessary. We further write ν_M for the distribution of the truncated configuration η^M given by $\eta^M(x) = \eta_0(x)$ for $|x| < M$ and $\eta^M(x) = 0$ otherwise, and $\mathbb{P}^\nu_M = \mathbb{P}^{\nu_M}$. The probability measure $\mathbb{P}^\nu_M$ is well defined and corresponds to the evolution of a countable-state Markov chain whose configurations contain only finitely many particles. Straightforward adaptations of a construction due to Andjel [1] imply that there exists a unique $\mathbb{P}^\nu$ with the property that,

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(E) = \lim_{M\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu_M(E), \tag{3}$$

for any event E that depends on a finite space-time window, i.e., that is measurable with respect to $(\eta_s(x) : |x| < t, s \in [0,t])$, for some $t < \infty$.

Activated random walk undergoes a transition from an active phase to phase in which the activity dies out with time (*local fixation)* almost surely. More formally, we say that local fixation occurs if the next condition holds,

$$\forall \text{ finite } W \subset \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \exists\, t_W \text{ s.t. } \forall t > t_W,\ W \text{ is stable at time } t$$

where "stable" means that the set hosts no A-particles. If local fixation does not hold, we say that ARW *is active*. In order to characterize the transition points between these two regimes, we introduce the critical particle density.

Definition 1 (Critical Density)**.** *Consider ARW with sleeping rate λ, jump distribution $p(\cdot)$, initial particle configuration distributed according to ν, which is a product of identical distributions having expectation μ. The critical particle density is defined as,*

$$\mu_c(\lambda, p(\cdot)) := \inf\{\mu \in (0,\infty) : \mathbb{P}^{\nu^\mu}(\ ARW \text{ is active }\ ) > 0\}. \tag{4}$$

From now on, we will specify the dependence of the critical density on the other parameters only if necessary. The monotonicity properties and the 0-1 law proved in [7] imply that, if ν^μ is a product of identical distributions stochastically increasing with μ and $\mu_c < \infty$, then for all $\mu > \mu_c$, ARW is active almost surely. Namely, there is a unique transition point between the two regimes which, furthermore, have both probability either zero or one to hold. Our first result involves ARW on the one dimensional lattice and it provides an estimation of the parameter region in which the system fixates almost surely.

Theorem 1.1. *Consider ARW on $\mathbb{Z}$ with sleeping rate λ, jump distribution $p(1) = q$, $p(-1) = 1-q$, where $q \in [0,1]$, initial particle configuration which is distributed according to a product of identical distributions having expectation μ. Then,*

$$\mu_c(\lambda, q) \geq B(\lambda, q), \tag{5}$$

where $B(\lambda, q)$ is defined by equations (41) and (44) and it satisfies the following properties,

1. *$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $B(\lambda, 0) = B(\lambda, 1) = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ (totally asymmetric case),*
2. *$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $B(\lambda, q)$ is increasing with respect to q in $[0, 1/2)$ (monotonicity),*
3. *$B(\lambda, q) = B(\lambda, 1-q)$ (reflection symmetry).*

See Figure 1 and Figure 2 for several plots of the function $B(\lambda, q)$. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 and of the fact that $\mu_c = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ in the totally asymmetric case [6].

Corollary 1.2. *For any fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the critical density $\mu_c(\lambda, q)$ is not a constant function of q.*

We conjecture that the critical density is increasing with respect to q in $[0, 1/2]$ and that it is decreasing with respect to q in $(1/2, 1]$. We now introduce our estimations of the parameter region in which ARW is active almost surely. Let $(Y(t))_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an infinite sequence of independent random variables such that $Y(t) = 1$ with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ and $Y(t) = 0$ with probability $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$. Let $X(t)$ be a random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with jump distribution $p(\,\cdot\,)$. Let the *expected jump* be denoted by

$$\mathbf{m} = \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} p(z)\, z, \tag{6}$$

and assume that $\mathbf{m}$ is different from the null vector. Call $\mathcal{F}_0$ the hyperplane intersecting the origin and orthogonal to $\mathbf{m}$. The hyperplane divides $\mathbb{R}^d$ in two half-spaces. Call $\mathcal{H}$ the set of sites in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that do not intersect $\mathcal{F}_0$ and that belong to the half space containing $\mathbf{m}$. In one dimension, $\mathcal{H}$ is the set $\mathbb{Z}_+$ or $\mathbb{Z}_-$, depending on the sign of $\mathbf{m}$. Let $F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,))$ be the probability that $Y(t) = 1$ only if $X(t) \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e.,

$$F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,)) := P\left(\forall t \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } Y(t) = 1, X(t) \in \mathcal{H}\right). \tag{7}$$

As a consequence of the law of large numbers, for any jump distribution such that $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}$, this probability is positive $\forall\lambda \geq 0$ and

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0} F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,)) = 1. \tag{8}$$

Indeed, after a *finite* number of steps, the walker spends infinite time in $\mathcal{H}$. Call $W = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : p(z) > 0\}$, the support of the jump distribution. The next theorem presents our upper bound for the critical density in one dimension.

Theorem 1.3. *Consider ARW on $\mathbb{Z}$ with sleeping rate λ, jump distribution $p(\,\cdot\,)$ having a finite support and such that $\mathbf{m} \neq 0$, and initial particle configuration distributed as a product of identical distributions having expectation $\mu < \infty$. Then,*

$$\mu_c \leq 1 - F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,)).$$

The next theorem presents our upper bound for the critical density in dimensions $d \geq 2$.

Theorem 1.4. *Consider ARW on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with sleeping rate λ, jump distribution $p(\,\cdot\,)$ having a finite support and such that $\mathbf{m} \neq 0$, and initial particle configuration distributed as a product of identical distributions having expectation $\mu < \infty$. Let $\nu_0 := \nu(\eta(\mathbf{0}) = 0)$ be the probability that a site is empty at time 0. Then,*

$$\mu_c \leq \frac{\nu_0}{F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,))}.$$

In the case of initial particle configuration distributed as a product of Bernoulli distributions ($\nu_0 = 1 - \mu$), the previous theorem states that

$$\mu_c \leq \frac{1}{F(\lambda, p(\,\cdot\,)) + 1}, \tag{9}$$

i.e., the critical density is strictly less than one for any value of λ. If one considers initial particle distributions different from Bernoulli, Theorem 1.4 implies that the critical density is strictly less than one if $\lambda < \lambda_0$, where λ_0 is some value which depends on the jump distribution and on ν_0. The theorem also implies that $\mu_c \to C$ as $\lambda \to 0$, where $0 \leq C \leq \nu_0$ is some constant. However, the same as in one dimension, we expect to be true that $\forall\lambda > 0$, $\mu_c < 1$ and that $\mu_c \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$.



Figure 2: Upper and lower bound (respectively, dashed and continuous lines) for the critical density in one dimension and jumps on nearest neighbours, $p(1) = q$ and $p(-1) = 1 - q$.

2 Description of the proofs

Our proofs rely on the discrete Diaconis-Fulton representation for the dynamics of ARW. As it has been proved in [7], local fixation for ARW is related to the stability properties of this representation, which leaves aside the chronological order of events.

At every site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, an infinite sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables $\{\tau^{x,j}\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is defined. Their outcomes are some operators ("instructions") acting on the current particle configuration by moving one particle from one site to the other one or by trying to let the particle turn to the S-state. Namely, every instruction on the site x is *"move to the site $x+z$"* with probability $\frac{p(z)}{1+\lambda}$ or *"sleep"* with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ independently. When the instruction "sleep" is "used" at one site, the particle turns to the S-state only if it does not share the site with other particles. On every site, it is possible to "use" only the instruction which has not been used before and which has the lowest index $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, only some actions are "legal", i.e., it is possible to use an instruction only if it hosts at least one active particle.

Local fixation for the dynamics of ARW is related to the the number of instructions that must be used in order to stabilize the initial particle configuration. Denote by B_L a compact subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $B_L \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ as $L \to \infty$. For every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(x)$ be the number of instructions that must be used at x in order to make the configuration η stable in B_L according to the instructions τ and denote by $\xi_{B_L,\eta,\tau}$ the corresponding stable configuration. A configuration is stable in B_L if there are no active particles in B_L. A fundamental property of the representation is *commutativity*, i.e., $\xi_{B_L,\eta,\tau}$ and $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}$ do not depend on the order according to which instructions have been used, under the restriction that only legal actions have been performed. The probability distribution of the whole construction is denoted by $\mathcal{P}^\nu$, which is the joint probability distribution of the set of instructions, and of ν, the probability distribution of the initial particle configuration. A second fundamental property of the representation is that if there exists a positive constant K such that for every integer L large enough,

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(0) = 0) \geq K, \tag{10}$$

then ARW fixates almost surely. Analogously, if there exists a positive constant K' such that for every integer L large enough,

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(x) > K' L) \geq K', \tag{11}$$

then ARW stays active almost surely. The proof of our results is based on the definition of stabilization algorithms for the set B_L and on counting the number of particles crossing the origin, which is chosen to belong to the inner boundary of B_L. In order to prove the upper bound (resp. the lower bound), we provide an estimation of the choice of parameters such that (10) (resp. 11) holds for every L large enough.

About the proof of the lower bound We now give an overview of the general strategy that has been employed for the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof is based on a refinement of the method that has been employed by Rolla and Sidoravicius in [7]. Call η the initial particle configuration and let τ be an array of instructions. As jumps are on nearest neighbours, $\tau \in \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, s\}^{\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{N}}$. We construct an algorithm that, given any pair η, τ, tries to stabilize all the particles initially present in η by using the instructions in τ. The algorithm is successful if $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(0) = 0$ and fails if $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(0) > 0$. Our goal is to provide an estimation of the parameter values such that the algorithm succeeds with uniformly positive probability for any

positive L. This implies local fixation for ARW. We consider the set $B_L := [-L, L]$ and we use different stabilization procedures for the half sets $[-L, 0]$ and $[0, L]$. Both stabilization procedures are such that some instructions "sleep" are ignored, as this does not decrease $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(0)$. We assume $q \leq 1/2$, without loss of generality. There are two possibilities: either $q = 1/2$ or $q < 1/2$. In the former case the stabilization procedure for $[-L, 0]$ and the one for $[0, L]$ succeed with the same probability, by symmetry. In the latter case, it is easy to show that $m_{[-L,0],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0$ with uniformly positive probability, independently on μ and on λ. Indeed, even in the case of $\lambda = 0$ (i.e., every particle performs a simple random walk with no interactions), no particles visit the origin with positive probability. The main issue is to estimate which conditions on μ and λ imply that $m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0$ with uniformly positive probability, provided that $q \leq 1/2$. We employ a stabilization algorithm for the set $[0, L]$ that is similar to the one that has been developed in [7]. The algorithm consists of applying a stabilization procedure to each particle. The procedure explores a certain set of instructions of τ and identifies a suitable *trap*, where an instruction "sleep" is located. The exploration follows the path that the particle would perform if we always toppled the site it occupies, and stops when the trap has been chosen. In the absence of a suitable trap, we declare the algorithm to have failed. The trap always lies on the exploration path, however not necessarily on its tip because we need to explore further away before taking the decision. Once the trap has been chosen, the particle is moved along the exploration path until it reaches the trap, where the instruction "sleep" let it turn to the S-state.

In order to control the spread of the activity, we require for the stabilization procedure that particles that are moved to their trap do not "wake up" particles that turned already to the S-state. At the same time, we need to conciliate such a requirement with the goal that the algorithm has positive probability of success. This imposes that the stabilization procedures not only succeeds with a high probability, but also that the probability of a successful exploration converges to 1 as long as more explorations are performed. We hence consider a procedure that tries to find the traps close together as much as possible, in order to leave more space for the explorations performed at the next steps.

In [7], the trap is identified according to the following criterion. Particles are settled one by one, starting from the leftmost one in $[0, L]$ and moving to the right. Every exploration is carried on until the trap that has been identified at the previous step has been reached. At any site that has been visited by the exploration, the last "explored" instruction must be "go left", as the starting site of the exploration is on the right of the site where the exploration ends. The trap is defined as the *leftmost instruction "sleep" among those that are located right below the last instructions "go left"*. Hence, by independence of instructions, every explored site has a chance $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ to have an instruction "sleep" right below the last instruction "go left". Then the distance between the new trap and the previous trap follows (roughly speaking) a geometric distribution with expectation $\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}$. In this article we choose a different criterion for the identification of the trap. This leads to an improvement of the estimation that has been provided by Rolla and Sidoravicius. In fact, by looking only at the instruction located right below the last instruction "go left", one actually ignores most of the instructions "sleep" which belong to the set of explored instructions. Informally, we define the trap as the *last instruction "sleep" that has been found during the exploration.* The main difficulty with such a definition is having a control on the joint distribution of the outcome of different explorations. Some of the explored instructions are not going to be used by the corresponding particle by the time it stops at the trap, leaving some *corrupted sites* that may interfere with the next steps. The same as in [7], in our proof we go for independence, which means that corrupted sites left by previous steps must be avoided. For this reason, in our proof we

introduce *barriers* that separate the region of corrupted sites from the region of unexplored sites. In our algorithm, every exploration is carried on until the barrier that has been chosen during the previous exploration has been reached. The barrier is defined as the *rightmost site on the explored path starting from the last instruction sleep*. The barrier is identified in such a way that the next exploration starts from a site that is located on its right. Furthermore, both the region of corrupted sites and the trap are located on sites that are located on the left of the barrier or on the barrier itself. In this way, the region of corrupted sites cannot be visited by the new exploration and the particles that turned to the S-state at the previous steps are not woken up when the new particle is moved. In the absence of a suitable barrier, we declare the algorithm to have failed. Our stabilization procedure is sensitive to the bias of the jump distribution. Indeed, the weaker is the bias, the larger is the average number of times the exploration visits the same site. This in turn implies that the weaker is the bias, the higher is the chance of finding instructions "sleep" close to the previous trap.

About the proof of the upper bounds One of the major difficulties in the proof of the upper bounds is that, on the contrary of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we cannot define an algorithm that ignores instructions "sleep". On the other hand, the advantage is that we do not need to define an algorithm that proceeds until the stabilization of the set is complete. Indeed, it is sufficient to stop the algorithm when a number of particles "large enough" crossed the origin, as any further action cannot decrease the number of visits at the origin.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 and of Theorem 1.4 is based on the following idea. Namely, we define a set B_L whose boundary contains the origin. For example, in one dimension $B_L = [-2L, 0]$ (assuming bias to the right), whereas in higher dimensions the definition of B_L is more elaborate. We define a stabilization procedure where particles are moved one by one until a certain event occurs. By "moving", we mean that we use always the instruction on the site where the particle is located until such an event occurs. Because of the order according to which particles are moved and of our definition of such "stopping" events, we show that with probability at least $F > 0$ the particle either fills one of the sites that was empty in the initial particle configuration or it leaves the set from the boundary side containing the origin, provided that the jump distribution is biased. Hence, if the density of particles which either fill an empty site or leave the set, $\mu \cdot F$, is higher than the density of empty sites ν_0, then a positive density of particles crosses the boundary side containing the origin. In one dimension this would be enough to imply almost sure activity when $\mu > \frac{\nu_0}{F}$. Indeed, as the number of sites belonging to the boundary does not grow with L (however, such a number is not necessarily one, as we take into account for "general" jump distributions), then necessarily a number of particles linear with L crosses the boundary with positive probability. Whereas, in two or more dimensions, this implication does not hold, as the number of sites belonging to the boundary grows with L as well. Thus, we need to control which boundary sites are crossed by the particles which jump away from B_L. Hence, we employ a method that has been used also in [8] to show that the number of visits on the sites of the boundary of B_L is quite "spread" along the boundary, i.e., any site of the boundary side containing the origin is visited by a number of particles that grows linearly with L with uniformly positive probability.

3 Diaconis-Fulton representation

In this section we describe the Diaconis-Fulton graphical representation for the dynamics of ARW. We follow [7]. Let $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0{}_\rho{}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ denote the particle configuration. A site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is *stable* in the configuration η if $\eta(x) \in \{0, \rho\}$ and it is *unstable* if $\eta(x) \geq 1$. We sample an array of independent *instructions* $\tau = (\tau^{x,j} : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\, j \in \mathbb{N})$, where $\tau^{x,j} = \tau_{xy}$ with probability $\frac{p(y-x)}{1+\lambda}$ or $\tau^{x,j} = \tau_{x\rho}$ with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. Let $h = (h(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ count the number of instructions used at each site. We say that we *use* an instruction at x when we act on the current particle configuration η through the operator Φ_x, which is defined as,

$$\Phi_x(\eta, h) = (\tau^{x,h(x)+1}\,\eta,\; h + \delta_x). \tag{12}$$

The operation Φ_x is *legal* for η if x is unstable in η, i.e., $\eta(x) \geq 1$, otherwise it is *illegal*. Finally we denote by $\mathcal{P}^\nu$ the joint law of η and τ, where η has distribution ν and it is independent from τ.

Properties. We now describe the properties of this representation. Later we discuss how they are related to the the stochastic dynamics of ARW. For $\alpha = (x_1, x_2, \dots x_k)$, we write $\Phi_\alpha = \Phi_{x_k}\Phi_{x_{k-1}} \dots \Phi_{x_1}$ and we say that Φ_α is *legal* for η if Φ_{x_l} is legal for $\Phi_{(x_{l-1},\dots,x_1)}(\eta, h)$ for all $l \in \{1, 2, \dots k\}$. Let $m_\alpha = (m_\alpha(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be given by,

$$m_\alpha(x) \;=\; \sum_l \mathbb{1}_{x_l = x},$$

the number of times the site x appears in α. We write $m_\alpha \geq m_\beta$ if $m_\alpha(x) \geq m_\beta(x)\ \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Analogously we write $\eta' \geq \eta$ if $\eta'(x) \geq \eta(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We also write $(\eta', h') \geq (\eta, h)$ if $\eta' \geq \eta$ and $h' = h$. Let η, η' be two configurations, x be a site in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and τ be a realization of the set of instructions. For the proof of the following properties we refer to [7].

Property 1 If α and α' are two legal sequences for η such that $m_\alpha = m_{\alpha'}$, then $\Phi_\alpha\eta = \Phi_{\alpha'}\eta$.

Property 2 $\Phi_\alpha\eta\,(x)$ is non-increasing in $m_\alpha(x)$ and non-decreasing in $m_\alpha(z)$, $z \neq x$.

Property 3 If x is unstable in η and $\eta'(x) \geq \eta(x)$, then x is unstable in η'.

Property 4 If $\eta' \geq \eta$ then $\Phi_x\eta' \geq \Phi_x\eta$.

Consequences. Let V be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. A configuration η is said to be *stable* in V if all the sites $x \in V$ are stable. We say that α is contained in V if all its elements are in V and we say that α *stabilizes* η in V if every $x \in V$ is stable in $\Phi_\alpha\eta$.

Lemma 1 (Least Action Principle) If α and β are legal sequences for η such that β is contained in V and α stabilizes η in V, then $m_\beta \leq m_\alpha$.

Lemma 2 (Abelian Property) If α and β are both legal sequences for η that are contained in V and stabilize η in V, then $m_\alpha = m_\beta$. In particular, $\Phi_\alpha\eta = \Phi_\beta\eta$.

By Lemma 2, $m_{V,\eta,\tau} = m_\alpha$ and $\xi_{V,\eta,\tau} = \Phi_\alpha\eta$ are well defined.

Lemma 3 (Monotonicity) If $V \subset V'$ and $\eta \leq \eta'$, then $m_{V,\eta,\tau} \leq m_{V',\eta',\tau}$.

By monotonicity, the limit

$$m_{\eta,\tau} = \lim_{V \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d} m_{V,\eta,\tau},$$

exists and does not depend on the particular sequence $V \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d$. The following lemma relates the dynamics of ARW to the stability property of the representation.

Lemma 4 Let ν be a translation-invariant, ergodic distribution with finite density $\nu(\eta(\mathbf{0}))$. Then $\mathbb{P}^\nu(\text{ ARW fixates locally }) = \mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{\eta,\tau}(\mathbf{0}) < \infty) \in \{0, 1\}$.

The next lemma states that by replacing an instruction "sleep" by a neutral instruction the number of instructions used at the origin for stabilization cannot decrease. Such a monotonicity property implies that the critical density is a non-decreasing function of λ. Thus, besides the τ_{xy} and $\tau_{x\rho}$, consider in addition the neutral instruction $\mathcal{I}$, given by $\mathcal{I}\,\eta = \eta$. Given two arrays $\tau = \left(\tau^{x,j}\right)_{x,\,j}$ and $\tilde{\tau} = \left(\tilde{\tau}^{x,j}\right)_{x,\,j}$, we write $\tau \leq \tilde{\tau}$ if for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, either $\tilde{\tau}^{x,j} = \tau^{x,j}$ or $\tilde{\tau}^{x,j} = \mathcal{I}$ and $\tau^{x,j} = \tau_{x\rho}$.

Lemma 5 (Monotonicity with enforced activation) Let τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ be two arrays of instructions such that $\tau \leq \tilde{\tau}$. Then, for any finite $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_{0\rho}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$,

$$m_{V,\eta,\tau} \leq m_{V,\eta,\tilde{\tau}}.$$

4 Lower bound in one dimension

We provide a lower bound for the probability that the origin is never visited during the stabilization of the set $[-L, L]$, by considering separately the stabilization of $[-L, 0]$ and of $[0, L]$. Indeed, observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[-L,L],\eta,\,\tau}(0) = 0) \\ \geq &\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[-L+1,0],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0) \cdot \mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[0,L-1],\eta,\,\tau}(0) = 0) \cdot \nu(\eta(0) = 0). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Inequality (13) is a consequence of the next relation, which is true for any array of instructions τ and initial particle configuration $\eta \in \Sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} &m_{[-L,-1],\eta,\tau}(-1) = 0,\ m_{[1,L],\eta,\tau}(1) = 0,\ \text{and } \eta(0) = 0 \\ \Longrightarrow\ &m_{[-L,L],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Hence, by using independence and translation invariance and by considering that $\nu(\eta(0) = 0) > 0$ (which is true as we assume $\mu < 1$), equation (13) is proved.

Our goal is to estimate under which conditions on μ, λ a q, the next condition holds,

$$\exists\, C > 0 \text{ s.t.} \forall L \in \mathbb{N},\ \ \mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{V_L,\eta,\tau}(0) = 0) > C. \tag{15}$$

for $V_L = [-L, L]$. From Lemma 4, (15) implies that ARW fixates locally. Without loss of generality, we consider $q \leq 1/2$. Indeed, the case of $q \geq 1/2$ can be recovered by reflection symmetry. First, we consider the stabilization of $[-L + 1, 0]$. We prove that if $q < 1/2$, then condition (15) is satisfied with $V_L = [-L + 1, 0]$ for any choice of μ and λ (Proposition 1).

Indeed, as the bias is to the left, then even in the case of $\lambda = 0$ (no interaction) there would be an uniformly positive probability of no particles visiting the origin. Second, we consider the stabilization of $[0, L-1]$. We prove that if $q \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mu < B(\lambda, q)$, where $B(\lambda, q)$ is a certain function of λ and q, then condition (15) holds with $V_L = [0, L-1]$. By symmetry and from equation (13), we conclude that if $\mu < B(q, \lambda)$, then (15) holds with $V_L = [-L, L]$.

We start with the proof of Proposition 1. As we prefer considering particles on the positive x-axis, we consider $q > \frac{1}{2}$ and we stabilize the set $[0, L]$.

Proposition 1. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 1.1, if $q > \frac{1}{2}$ then for every value of λ there exists $C_1(\mu, q) > 0$ such that $\forall L \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0) \geq C_1(\mu, q). \tag{16}$$

Proof. Let N_L be the number of particles in $[0, L]$. Let X_i be the site of the i-th closest particle to the origin. Every particle has a different label $1 \leq i \leq N_L$ and the relative order among particles located on the same site is irrelevant. For every τ, we denote by τ' the array of instructions obtained from τ by replacing all the instructions "sleep" located on sites $x \geq 0$ by a neutral instruction. This means that the particles do not interact in $[0, L]$ and that they are always active until they leave the set. Lemma 5 guarantees that $m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0) \leq m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau'}(0)$. Hence, $\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau'}(0) = 0) \leq \mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0)$. We stabilize the set as follows. We choose arbitrarily a particle and we move it until either it reaches the site 0 or the site $L+1$. By "move" we mean that we always use the instruction on the site where the particle is located until the particle leaves the set. Then, we do the same for all the other particles, until all of them left the set. By independence of instructions, the path of every particle is distributed as a simple random walk. We denote by $P_x(\,\cdot\,)$ the law of the simple random walk starting from the site $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and by T_y the first time the random walk hits $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. As the expected distance between two consecutive particles is $1/\mu$, for every δ small and positive and for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, the next inequality holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau'}(0) = 0) &\geq \nu\left(1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ X_i > (\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)\, i\right) \\
&\quad \cdot \mathcal{P}^\nu\left(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0) = 0 \;\middle|\; 1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ X_i > (\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)\, i\right) \\
&\geq C_2(\delta, \mu) \cdot \lim_{L\to\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{L}{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}} P_{\lceil(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)\, i\rceil}(T_0 > T_{L+1}) \\
&\geq C_3(\delta, \mu) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\infty}\left(1 - (\frac{1-q}{q})^{\lceil(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)\, i\rceil}\right) \\
&\geq C_4(\delta, \mu, q) > 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the functions C_j are positive. This concludes the proof of the proposition. □

We now estimate the second term in the product of the right side of the inequality (13), assuming that $q \leq \frac{1}{2}$. We define a stabilization procedure for the set $[0, L]$. We label particles in $[0, L]$ from the left to the right, as in the proof of Proposition 1. The procedure is divided into several steps. Every step corresponds to the stabilization of an A-particle. The step can be either successful or unsuccessful. A *successful step* means that, by using some of the instructions belonging to the array, one A-particle either reaches a site where it turns to the



Figure 3: Representation of the first exploration. *Left:* instructions belonging to the first exploration. *Right:* representation of the first exploration as a simple random walk path. Red circles represent the steps of such a path that are related to the presence of an instruction "sleep". In the example in the figure, the trap and the barrier are identified with the same site.

S-state or it leaves from the right absorbing boundary $L+1$ and that in both cases it does not wake up any S-particle. If every step is successful, then no instructions at the origin are used during stabilization and we say that *the stabilization procedure is successful*. If at least one step is unsuccessful, then we say that *the procedure fails*. At every step i we perform three actions: first, we associate to the particle a set of instructions (*exploration*). This means that we explore the putative trajectory of the particle until either a *barrier* $A^{i-1,L}$ that has been identified at the previous step is reached, or the exploration leaves the boundary. Second, we use part of these instructions and we move the particle until it reaches a properly chosen site T^i, called *trap*, where an instruction "sleep" let the A-particle turn to the S-state. Finally, we identify a new *barrier* $A^{i,L}$. The barrier $A^{i,L}$ is needed to define the range of the next exploration $i+1$. The choice of $A^{i,L}$ is made in such a way that the instructions "explored" at the previous steps are not explored again at the $i+1$-th exploration (independence of instructions at every exploration is preserved) and in such a way that particles in the S-state are not woken up by the $i+1$-th particle. Furthermore, $A^{i,L}$ is located the closest as possible to A^{i-1}, the barrier identified at the previous step. This guarantees that large space is available for the stabilization of the next particles. If it is not possible to define a barrier $A^{i,L}$ that satisfies such conditions, we claim that the stabilization procedure fails. We denote a failure at the i-th step by setting $A^{j,L} := \infty$ for all $j \geq i$. If a failure occurs, we stop the stabilization algorithm. Below, we describe the i-th step in detail, assuming that all steps until the $i-1$-th one have been successful. This means that for every $j < i-1$, $A^{j,L} \leq A^{j+1,L} < \infty$, and that every particle having label $j \leq i-1$ has turned to the S-state and it is located on a site $\leq A_j$. For the first step, we set the barrier $A_0 := 0$.

1. **exploration**: we assume that all steps until $i-1$ have been successful. This means that the barrier $A^{i-1,L}$ has been identified and that all particles $1, 2, \ldots i-1$ are in the S-state and are located on a site $\leq A^{i-1,L}$. We denote by X^i the location of the i-th particle in the initial configuration. If $X^i \leq A^{i-1,L}$, then the i-th exploration fails and we set $A^{j,L} := \infty$ for all $j \geq i$. Whereas, if $X^i > A^{i-1,L}$, we perform an exploration starting from the site X^i, until either the site $A^{i-1,L}$ or the site $L+1$ is reached. The

explored trajectory is represented by a pair

$$\{ S^i(t), Y^i(t) \}_{0 \le t \le T^i} \tag{18}$$

and it is defined as follows. We define $S^i(0) = X^i$ and we "read" the instructions that have not been read at $S^i(0)$ previously until we find an instruction that is an arrow. If the first of the instructions read at $S^i(0)$ is "move", then we define $Y^i(0) := 0$, otherwise we define $Y^i(0) := 1$. Hence, we move one step in the direction indicated by the instruction "move" and we denote by $S^i(1)$ the new site. Then, we read instructions at $S^i(1)$ that have not been read previously until we find an instruction that is an arrow. If the first of the instructions read at $S^i(1)$ is an arrow, we define $Y^i(1) := 0$, otherwise we define $Y^i(1) := 1$. We move one step in the direction of the arrow and we define the new site as $S^i(2)$. We carry on such a procedure until the first time t such that $S^i(t) \in \{A^{i-1,L}, L+1\}$. We denote such a time by T^i. See also Figure 4.

2. **trap and barrier allocation**: The identification of the trap and of the barrier at the i-th step depends on the set of instructions corresponding to the i-th exploration. Let T^i_x be the first time the i-th exploration hits the site $x \in \mathbb{N}$. If $T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} > T^i_{L+1}$, then we replace all the instructions "sleep" belonging to the explored trajectory by a neutral instructions, we move the particle until it reaches the absorbing boundary $L+1$ and we set $A_i := A_{i-1}$. Whereas, if $T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} < T^i_{L+1}$, then we replace all the instructions "sleep" belonging to the explored trajectory by a neutral instruction except for the last instruction "sleep" that has been found before hitting $A^{i-1,L}$. Hence, we move the particle until such an instruction "sleep" is reached. The site of such a barrier is defined as the new trap T^i. Moreover, we define the barrier $A^{i,L}$ as the *rightmost visited site starting from the last instruction "sleep"* (see Figure 3 and Figure 5). This guarantees that, after the i-th exploration, all the instructions in $(A^{i,L}, \infty)$ that have been "explored" (i.e., the outcome of the random variables is known) have also been "used" by the particle. If no instructions "sleep" belong to the explored trajectory, we declare the stabilization procedure is unsuccessful and we set $A^{j,L} := \infty$ for all $j \ge i$. More formally, let T^*_i be the last time of the exploration such that $Y^i(t) = 1$ and set $T^i_* := +\infty$ if no instructions "sleep" belong to the explored set,

$$T^i_* := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } 0 \le \forall t < T^i,\ Y^i(t) = 0 \\ \max\{t \in \mathbb{N} : 0 \le t < T_i,\ Y^i(t) = 1\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

Recalling that $X^i > A^{i-1,L}$, (we set $A^{i,L} := \infty$ otherwise), we define the trap for the particle i as follows. Namely,

$$A^{i,L} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} > T^i_{L+1} \\ \infty & \text{if } T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} < T^i_{L+1} \text{ and } T^i_* = \infty \\ \max\{S(t) : T^i_* \le t < T^i_{A^{i-1,L}}\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

If every step $1 \le i \le N_L$ is *successful*, then the stabilization procedure of the set $[0, L]$ is *successful*. If all the steps 1, 2, ..., $i-1$ are successful and the step i is unsuccessful, we stop the stabilization algorithm, we define all steps $j \ge i$ as unsuccessful and we set $A_j := \infty$ for all $i \le j \le N_L$. By independence of instructions, which is implied by our criterion for the identification of barriers and traps, explorations are such that the random variables $\{ S^i(t)\}_{0 \le t \le T^i}$ in (18) are distributed as a simple random walk starting from X^i and $\{ Y^i(t) \}_{0 \le t \le T^i}$ are independent random variables having outcome 1 with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ and 0 with probability $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$.



Figure 4: Representation of the second step of the stabilization procedure. *Left:* the dark region represents the first exploration. The instructions below the continuous line in the non-dark region represent the second exploration. *Right:* representation of the second exploration as a simple random walk path. Red circles denote that the corresponding step of the path is related to the presence of an instruction "sleep". Referring to the path in the figure as an example, according to the criterion employed in [7] the trap would be taken as the site hosting the rightmost among the two instructions "sleep". Whereas, according to our criterion, the trap is identified as the site denoted by T^2 in the figure. Furthermore, the barrier is identified as the site denoted by $A^{2,L}$.



Figure 5: Diagrammatic representation of the conditions in the definition of the barrier $A^{i,L}$ after the i-th exploration, assuming that the first $i-1$ steps of the stabilization procedure have been successful.

Probability of successful stabilization: As by replacing instructions "sleep" from the array τ by a neutral instruction the value $m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0)$ does not decrease, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}^{\nu}(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0)=0) &\geq \mathcal{P}^{\nu}(1\leq \forall i\leq N_L,\ \ A^{i,L}<\infty)\\ &\geq \mathcal{P}^{\nu}(1\leq \forall i\leq N_L,\ \ A^{i,L}\leq X_i),\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We estimate the probability of the right-hand side of the previous inequality. Let us introduce the random variables,

$$\Delta A^{i,L} := A^{i,L} - A^{i-1,L}, \tag{22}$$

for every integer $1 \leq i \leq N_L$. Such random variables $(\Delta A^{i,L})_{1\leq i\leq N_L}$ are not independent and difficult to handle. Hence, in order to provide a lower bound to the last expression in (21), we define a new sequence of random variables $(\Delta \tilde{A}^i)_{1\leq i\leq N_L}$, which are independent and identically distributed, and which satisfy the next inequality for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}^{\nu}(1\leq \forall i\leq N_L,\ \ A^{i,L}\leq X^i) &= \mathcal{P}^{\nu}(1\leq \forall i\leq N_L,\ \ \sum_{j=1}^{i}\Delta A^{j,L}\leq \sum_{j=1}^{i}\Delta X^j)\\ &\geq P^{\nu}(1\leq \forall i\leq N_L,\ \ \sum_{j=1}^{i}\Delta \tilde{A}^{j}\leq \sum_{j=1}^{i}\Delta X^j),\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where P denotes the probability distribution of the random variables $\tilde{A}^i$, P^{ν} denotes the product measure $P \times \nu$, and $\Delta X^j := X^j - X^{j-1}$. As $E[\Delta X^1] = 1/\mu$, it follows that if

$$1/\mu > E[\Delta \tilde{A}^1], \tag{24}$$

then from the law of large numbers, from (21) and from (23), there exists $C_5 > 0$ such that for every positive integer L,

$$\mathcal{P}^{\nu}(m_{[0,L],\eta,\tau}(0)=0) \geq C_5. \tag{25}$$

Hence, by defining the function $B(\lambda, q)$ in the statement of Theorem 1.1 as,

$$B(\lambda,q) := B(\lambda,1-q) := \frac{1}{E[\Delta \tilde{A}^1]}, \tag{26}$$

the statement of Theorem 1.1 is proved.

Thus, in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need to provide a definition of the random variables $(\Delta \tilde{A}^i)_{1\leq i\leq N_L}$ in such a way that inequality (23) is satisfied and we need to compute $E[\Delta \tilde{A}^1]$. The random variables $\Delta \tilde{A}^i$ are defined as follows. For every integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$P(\Delta \tilde{A}^i = k) := \lim_{y\to\infty}\lim_{L\to\infty} \mathcal{P}^{\nu}(A^{i,L} - A^{i-1,L} = k \,|\, A^{i-1,L} < \infty, X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y), \tag{27}$$

where we recall that the barrier $A^{i,L}$ is defined by equation (20). By taking the limit $L \to \infty$, the right absorbing boundary is moved infinitely far to the right. By taking the limit $y \to \infty$, the starting point of the exploration is moved infinitely far to the right. We now prove that the random variables $\Delta \tilde{A}^i$ satisfy the inequality (23). Firstly, we observe that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\Delta \tilde{A}^i = k) = 1, \tag{28}$$



Figure 6: Representation of the path of the i-th exploration. Instructions "sleep" are represented by a circle on the path. $\Delta A^{i,L} \geq k \geq 1$ if and only if no instruction "sleep" belong to the path between the time $T^i_{A^{i-1,L}+k,A^{i-1,L}}$ and $T^i_{A^{i-1,L}}$ and at the same time the path reaches $A^{i-1,L}$ before $L+1$, as in the example in the figure.

as, in the limit $y \to \infty$, at least an instruction sleep belongs to the exploration that starts from $A^{i-1,\infty}+y$ and reaches $A^{i-1,\infty}$ almost surely. Secondly, observe that by the Markov property, for any positive integer k, y, x such that $y \geq k$, the next expression

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} P(\Delta A^{i,L} = k \,|\, A^{i-1,L} = x, X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y) \tag{29}$$

does not depend on x and y. Indeed, conditioning on the event $\{A^{i-1,\infty} < \infty, X^i = A^{i-1,\infty} + y\}$, the occurrence of $\{\Delta A^{i,\infty} = k\}$ depends only on the steps of the exploration performed once the site $A^{i,\infty}+k+1$ has been reached for the first time. Such a site is hit almost surely, provided that $q \leq 1/2$ and that the starting point of the exploration is on its right. Thirdly, observe that the next expression

$$P(\Delta A^{i,L} \geq k \,|\, A^{i-1,L} < \infty, X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y), \tag{30}$$

is non-decreasing with L. Indeed, let $T^i_{x,z}$ be the last time the i-th exploration visits the site x before visiting z for the first time and set $T^i_{x,z} = \infty$ if the exploration hits z before hitting x or if it never visits x. From the definition (20) and conditioning on $\{A^{i-1,L} < \infty, X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y\}$, it follows that if $1 \leq k \leq y$, then

$$\{\Delta A^{i,L} \geq k\} \iff \{Y^i(t) = 0,\ T^i_{A^{i-1,L}+k,A^{i-1,L}} < \forall t < T^i_{A^{i-1,L}}\} \cap \{T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} < T^i_{L+1}\}. \tag{31}$$

See also Figure 6. Clearly, the probability of the previous event does not decrease with L. Hence, as we observed that for any integer $k \geq 1$ the quantity (30) is non-decreasing with L, it follows that

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ A^{i,M} \leq X^i) \geq \mathcal{P}^\nu(1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ A^{i,M+1} \leq X^i). \tag{32}$$

(the reader should recall that the superscript of $A^{i,M}$ indicates that the right boundary for the exploration corresponds to the site $M+1$). This just means that, by making less restrictive the condition according to which particles are "lost", the probability of successful stabilization of the set $[0,L]$ does not increase. In order to prove (32), one should rewrite the first term in (32) as a sum over all possible realizations of $\Delta A^{i,M}$ and X^i satisfying the condition $\{1 \le \forall i \le N_L,\ A^{i,M} \le X^i\}$ and then use that (30) is non-decreasing with L. The reader who finds the proof of (32) obvious, may skip this step and jump directly to (36). First, we rewrite,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}^\nu(1 \le \forall i \le N_L,\ A^{i,M} \le X^i) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{N_L=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{x_1,x_2\ldots x_{N_L}: \\ 0\le x_1\le x_2\ldots\le x_{N_L}\le L}} \nu(X^1 = x_1, X^2, = x_2 \ldots X^{N_L} = x_{N_L}) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathcal{P}^\nu(\Delta A^{1,M} \le x_1,\ \Delta A^{1,M} + \Delta A^{2,M} \le x_2, \ldots, \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N_L} \Delta A^{i,M} \le x_{N_L} \ \Big|\ 1 \le \forall i \le N_L, X^i = x_i) \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we observe that, for any $0 \le x_1 \le x_2 \ldots\ldots \le x_{N_L}$, for every $1 \le k \le N_L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}^\nu(A^{1,M} \le x_1, \ldots A^{k,M} \le x_k, \\
&\qquad A^{k+1,M+1} \le x_{k+1}, \ldots, A^{N_L,M+1} \le x_{N_L} \ \Big|\ 1 \le \forall i \le N_L, X^i = x_i) \ge \\
&\qquad\qquad \mathcal{P}^\nu(A^{1,M} \le x_1, \ldots A^{k,M+1} \le x_k,\ A^{k+1,M+1} \le x_{k+1}, \ldots, \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad A^{N_L,M+1} \le x_{N_L} \ \Big|\ 1 \le \forall i \le N_L, X^i = x_i). \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the next expression (which equals the left-hand side of (34)),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\Delta a_1,\Delta a_2,\ldots\Delta a_{k-1} \\ 1\le\forall i\le k,\, \Delta a_i \le x_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\Delta a_j}} \mathcal{P}^\nu(1 \le \forall j < k,\ \Delta A^{j,M} = \Delta a_j \ \big|\ X^j = x_j,\, 1 \le \forall j < k) \\
&\qquad \times \sum_{\Delta a_k=0}^{x_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\Delta a_j} \mathcal{P}^\nu(\Delta A^{k,M} = \Delta a_k \ \big|\ X^k = x_k, A^{k-1,M} = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\Delta a_j) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathcal{P}^\nu(k+1 \le \forall i \le N_L,\ \Delta A^{i,M+1} \le x_i - \sum_{j=1}^{k}\Delta a_j \ \big| \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad k+1 \le \forall j \le N_L,\, X^j = x_j,\, A^{k,M} = \sum_{j=1}^{k}\Delta a_j), \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

is such that the third term in the product is a non-increasing function of Δa_k and $\mathcal{P}^\nu(\Delta A^{k,M} = \Delta a_k \ \big|\ X^k = x_k, A^{k-1,M} = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\Delta a_j)$ in the second term is non-increasing with M if $\Delta a_k = 0$ and non-decreasing with M if $\Delta a_k > 0$, as it follows from (31). Then, by replacing $M+1$ with M in the second term, the value of the whole expression (35) does not increase. Hence,

by using (34) for the second term of (33) with $k = N_L$ first, then with $k = N_L - 1$, $k = N_L - 2$ and so on, inequality (32) is proved.

Furthermore, as the quantity (29) does not depend on y, provided that $y \geq k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{M\to\infty} \mathcal{P}^\nu(1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ A_i^M \leq X_i) = \\
&\quad \sum_{N_L=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{x_1,x_2\ldots x_{N_L}:\\ 0\leq x_1\leq x_2\ldots\leq x_{N_L}\leq L}} \nu(X^1 = x_1, X^2, = x_2 \ldots X^{N_L} = x_{N_L}) \times \sum_{\substack{\Delta a_1,\Delta a_2,\ldots\Delta a_{N_L}:\\ \Delta a_i\leq x_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\Delta a_j}} \\
&\qquad \prod_{i=1}^{N_L} \lim_{M\to\infty} \mathcal{P}^\nu(\Delta A^{i,M} = \Delta a_i \ \Big|\ X^i = x^i, A^{i-1,M} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\Delta a_j) \\
&\quad = \sum_{N_L=0}^{L} \sum_{\substack{x_1,x_2\ldots x_{N_L}:\\ 0\leq x_1\leq x_2\ldots\leq x_{N_L}\leq L}} \nu(X^1 = x_1, X^2, = x_2 \ldots X^{N_L} = x_{N_L}) \\
&\qquad \times \sum_{\substack{\Delta a_1,\Delta a_2,\ldots\Delta a_{N_L}:\\ \Delta a_i\leq x_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\Delta a_j}} \prod_{i=1}^{N_L} P(\Delta\tilde{A}^i = \Delta a_i\,) \\
&\qquad = P^\nu(1 \leq \forall i \leq N_L,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i} \Delta\tilde{A}^j \leq X^i). \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (23). Hence, recalling the considerations made after equation (23), we proved that if $\mu < B(\lambda, 1-q) = B(\lambda, q) := \frac{1}{\Delta\tilde{A}^1}$, then ARW fixates.

We now estimate $E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1]$. Firstly, recall that $\Delta\tilde{A}^1 < \infty$ (equation 28). Then, from (31) and as $\Delta\tilde{A}^1 \geq 0$ a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1] &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\Delta\tilde{A}^1 \geq k) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lim_{y\to\infty}\lim_{L\to\infty} \mathcal{P}^\nu\Big(Y^i(t) = 0,\ T^i_{A^{i-1,L}+k,A^{i-1,L}} < \forall t < T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} \\
&\qquad \text{and } T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} < T^i_{L+1} \ \Big|\ X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y,\ A^{i-1,L} < \infty\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lim_{y\to\infty}\lim_{L\to\infty} \mathcal{P}^\nu\Big(Y^i(t) = 0,\ T^i_{A^{i-1,L}+k,A^{i-1,L}} < \forall t < T^i_{A^{i-1,L}}, \\
&\qquad T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} < T^i_{L+1} \text{ and } T^i_{A^{i-1,L}} - T^i_{A^{i-1,L}+k,A^{i-1,L}} = j \ \Big| \\
&\qquad\qquad X^i = A^{i-1,L} + y,\ A^{i-1,L} < \infty\Big) \qquad (37) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lim_{y\to\infty}\lim_{L\to\infty} P_y\Big(T_0 - T_{k,0} = j, T_0 < T_L\Big)\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\right)^{j-1} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lim_{y\to\infty} P_y\Big(T_0 - T_{k,0} = j\Big)\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\right)^{j-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

where P_y denotes the law of a simple random walk starting from $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $T_{x,z}$ denotes the last time the site x is visited before visiting z for the first time. In the third equality we have

summed over the probability of disjoint events. Let us denote by T^+ the time the random walk returns to the starting point. By the Markov property,

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} P_y(T_0 - T_{k,0} = j) = P_0(T_{-k} = j \;\Big|\; T_{-k} < T^+). \tag{38}$$

Let $g(\lambda) := \frac{1}{1+\lambda}$, $H_n = -1 + \sum_{1\le i\le n} Z_i$, where Z_i are the increments of a simple random walk, and let $\mu_m := \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{n\ge 0} \;:\; H_n = m\}$. Hence, by using (38),

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1] &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P_0(T_{-k} = j \;\Big|\; T_{-k} < T_0^+)\cdot g^{j-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(\mu_{-k} = j-1 \;\Big|\; \mu_{-k} < \mu_0)\cdot g^{j-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E[g^{\mu_{-k}} \;\Big|\; \mu_{-k} < \mu_0], \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the second P is the law of the process H_n and $E[\,\cdot\,]$ denotes its expectation. Let $M_n := g^n A^{-H_n}$ and observe that $E[M_{n+1}] = E[M_n] = A$ if $A^2 - \frac{1}{g(1-q)}A + \frac{q}{1-q} = 0$. Let A_+ and A_- be respectively the largest and the smallest solution of such an equality. By the optional stopping theorem, if $A = A_+$ or $A = A_-$,

$$\begin{aligned} E[M_{\min(\mu_{-k},\mu_0)}] = E[M_0] &= A \\ &= P(\mu_{-k} < \mu_0)\cdot E\left[g^{\mu_{-k}} \;\Big|\; \mu_{-k} < \mu_0\right]\cdot A^k \\ &\qquad + P(\mu_0 < \mu_{-k})\cdot E\left[g^{\mu_0} \;\Big|\; \mu_{-k} > \mu_0\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Hence, by solving the linear system with A_+ and A_-, we derive

$$E\left[g^{\mu_k} \;\Big|\; \mu_{-k} < \mu_0\right] = \frac{1}{P(\mu_{-k} < \mu_0)}\cdot \frac{A_+ - \frac{1}{A_+}\cdot\frac{1-q}{q}}{A_+^k - (\frac{1}{A_+}\frac{1-q}{q})^k}, \tag{41}$$

where

$$A_+ = \frac{1}{2(1-q)g}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4q(1-q)g^2}\right), \tag{42}$$

and

$$P(\mu_{-k} < \mu_0) = P_{-1}(T_{-k} < T_0) = \begin{cases} 1/k & \text{if } q = \frac{1}{2} \\ \dfrac{1-\frac{q}{1-q}}{1-\left(\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^k} & \text{if } q < 1/2. \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

Hence, if $q \le \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{1}{B(\lambda,q)} := E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E[g^{\mu_{-k}} | \mu_{-k} < \mu_0], \tag{44}$$

and if $\frac{1}{2} < q \le 1$, $B(\lambda,q) := B(\lambda, 1-q)$.

We now prove the properties 1 and 2 of the function $B(\lambda,q)$ in the statement of the theorem. Observe first that if $q = 0$, then $P_0(T_{-k} = j \;\Big|\; T_{-k} < T_0^+) = \delta_{j,k}$. From (39), this

implies that $E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1] = \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}$. Now we prove that $E[\Delta\tilde{A}^1]$ is decreasing with respect to q in $[0, \frac{1}{2})$. In particular, for any positive integer k, $P(\Delta\tilde{A}^1 \geq k)$ is decreasing with respect to q in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Let then $y(q) := (1-q)\cdot q$, which is strictly increasing with respect to q in $[0, 1/2)$, and let $N_{k,j}$ be the number of paths of j steps that start from the origin, hit for the first time $-k$ at the j-th step and do no return to the origin. Then, from (39),

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Delta\tilde{A}^1 \geq k) &= \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{N_{k,j}\cdot q^{\frac{k+j}{2}}\cdot(1-q)^{\frac{j-k}{2}}}{\sum\limits_{j=k} N_{k,j}\cdot q^{\frac{k+j}{2}}\cdot(1-q)^{\frac{j-k}{2}}}\cdot g^{j-1} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{N_{k,k+2m}}{\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} N_{k,k+2n}\cdot y^n}(y\cdot g^2)^m\cdot g^{k-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

as the coefficients $N_{k,j}$ are positive only if $j-k$ is even. It is easy to see that the function (45) is decreasing with respect to y. Indeed, the derivative with respect to y of the function (45),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m,n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{(m\cdot g^{2m} - n\cdot g^{2m})\cdot N_{k+2m}\cdot N_{k+2n}\cdot y^{m+n-1}}{(\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} N_{k,k+2n}\cdot y^n)^2}\cdot g^{k-1} \\ =& -\sum_{\substack{m,n\in\mathbb{N}:\\ m\neq n}} \frac{n\cdot g^{2m}\cdot N_{k+2m}\cdot N_{k+2n}\cdot y^{m+n-1}}{(\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} N_{k,k+2n}\cdot y^n)^2}\cdot g^{k-1} \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

is negative for any $y, g \in (0,1)$. This implies that the function (45) is decreasing with respect to q in $[0, 1/2)$ for any positive integer k.

□

5 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Without loss of generality we assume $\mathbf{m} > 0$ and we consider the set $B_L = [-2L, 0]$. The case $\mathbf{m} < 0$ can be recovered by reflection symmetry. We stabilize only particles in $[-L, 0]$, but we consider the site $-2L-1$ as the outer boundary of the set, i.e., once a particle is on a site $\leq -2L-1$ it is "lost".

Let $\tilde{N}_0^L$ be the number of particles in $[-L, 0]$. First, we "move" every particle starting in $[-L, 0]$ until every site of $[-L, 0]$ is either empty or it hosts only one active particle. This means that if the site hosts initially $n > 1$ particles, we move $n-1$ particles until each of them fills an empty site. By "moving", we mean that we always use the instruction on the site where the particle is located until the particle reaches an empty site. Now, every site in $[-L, 0]$ either hosts one particle or is empty. Let N_0^L be the number of particles in $[-L, 0]$. The next proposition states that with uniformly positive probability we loose a number of particles that is bounded from above by a number that not depend on L. The proof of the proposition is postponed.

Proposition 2. *There exist two positive constants c and K such that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathcal{P}^{\nu}\left(\tilde{N}_0^L - N_0^L \leq c\right) \geq K. \tag{47}$$

Now every site in $[-L,0]$ hosts at most one particle, which is necessarily active. We stabilize the set $[-L,0]$ according to the following rule. Let $z_0=-L$. If the site is empty, we do not do anything. If z_0 hosts one particle, then we move it until one of the following events occurs: **(1)** the particle sleeps somewhere in $[-2L,z_0]$, **(2)** the particle reaches a site $x\le -2L-1$, **(3)** the particle reaches the first empty site in $[z_0+1,0]$, **(4)** the particle reaches a site $x\ge 0$. If (3) or (4) occur, we say that a *successful jump* has been performed.

As the random walk is biased to the right, we can uniformly bound from below by a constant F_L the probability of a successful jump. Indeed, consider now a random walk $(Z(j))_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ starting from $Z(0)=z_0$ in the following environment. Namely, if $y>z_0$ then the walker located at y jumps to $y+z$ with probability $p(z)$. If $y\le z_0$, then the walker jumps to $y+z$ with probability $\frac{p(z)}{1+\lambda}$ and it sleeps with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. As the random walk $(Z(j))_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ can sleep on *any* site in $(z_0-L,z_0]$ and as $z_0-L\ge -2L$, then the probability of a successful jump in the activated random walk model cannot be smaller than F_L.

Now let $z_1=z_0+1$ and observe that every site in $[z_1,0]$ is either empty or it hosts one active particle. Let N_1^L be the number of particles in $[z_1,0]$. If z_1 hosts no particles, we do not do anything. Whereas, if z_1 hosts one particle, we move such a particle as before, until one of the four events above occurs. Again, a successful jump occurs with probability at least F_L. We then define $z_2=z_1+1$ and we continue in this way until we reach z_L. We observe that, at every step i, $N_{i+1}^L=N_i^L$ with probability at least F_L and $N_{i+1}^L=N_i^L-1$ with probability at most $1-F_L$.

Now we define

$$F:=\lim_{L\to\infty}F_L,$$

which corresponds to the constant (7) defined before the statement of the theorem. We observe that for any positive real ϵ, $N_0^L\ge(\mu-\epsilon)\cdot L$ and $N_L^L\ge N_0^L-(1-F+\epsilon)\cdot L=(\mu-1+F-2\,\epsilon)\cdot L$ with high probability as L is large enough. Hence, for any positive δ such that $\mu=1-F+\delta$, we let $\epsilon:=\frac{\delta}{3}$ and we conclude that $N_L^L\ge\frac{\delta}{3}\cdot L$ with high probability. Now, observe that N_L^L corresponds to the number of particles that left the set $[-2L,0]$ from the right boundary. In case of jumps on nearest neighbours, each of these particles must have crossed the origin. In case of biased distribution with general (finite) support, the same conclusion does not hold. Hence, let $Q_L:=\{z\in[-L,0]\,:\,\exists x\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus[-L,0]\ \text{s.t. }\ p(x-z)>0\}$ be the inner boundary of B_L and let k_2 be a constant such that $|Q_L|\le k_2$ for every L. Thus, as at least N_L^L particles left the set $[-2L,0]$, then $\exists z\in Q_L$ such that $m_{[-2L,0],\eta,\tau}(z)\ge\frac{\delta}{3k_2}\cdot L$ with high probability. By the union bound, this implies that there exists a site $z\in Q_L$ such that for every L large enough,

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu\left(m_{[-2L,0],\eta,\tau}(z)\ge\frac{\delta}{3k_2}\cdot L\right)\ge\frac{1}{2k_2}. \tag{48}$$

Hence, by using translation invariance and by Lemma 4 we conclude that ARW stays active almost surely.

□

We now prove Proposition 2. We present an argument that holds also in the case of symmetric jump distributions, although the bias would make the proof even simpler.

Proof of Proposition 2. We prove the proposition by contradiction. Assume the statement is wrong, i.e., $\forall c>0$,

$$\inf_{L\in\mathbb{N}}\{\,\mathcal{P}^\nu(\,\tilde{N}_0^L-N_0^L\,\le c\,)\,\}=0. \tag{49}$$

This means that $\forall c > 0$ there exists L^* such that

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(\, \tilde{N}_0^{L^*} - N_0^{L^*} \, > c\,) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{50}$$

i.e., at least c particles leave $[-L^*, 0]$. Let Q_{L^*} be the inner boundary of $[-L^*, 0]$ and let k_2 be an uniform upper bound for $|Q_{L^*}|$, as before. As at least c particles leave the set, there exists one site $z \in Q_{L^*}$ which is crossed by at least c/k_2 particles. Hence, by using the union bound, we conclude that there exists at least one site $z \in Q_{L^*}$ such that $\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[-L^*,0],\eta,\tau}(z) > \frac{c}{k_2}\,) \geq \frac{1}{2k_2}$. Then, by using translation invariance, we conclude that for every c there exists L^* such that

$$\mathcal{P}^\nu(m_{[-L^*-z,-z],\eta,\tau}(0) > \frac{c}{k_2}\,) \geq \frac{1}{2k_2}, \tag{51}$$

As c is arbitrarily large, from Lemma 4 we conclude that ARW sustains activity almost surely. Now, observe that L^* and (51) does not depend on the value of the parameter λ, as sleeping instructions that have been used during the procedure have no effect. Hence, we proved that ARW with $\mu < 1$ sustains activity almost surely even for arbitrarily large λ. However, we know from [7] (or from Theorem 1.1) that in one dimension $\mu_c \to 1$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Thus, we found a contradiction. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We present the proof in the case of two dimensions. The same arguments can be adapted to the case of more than two dimensions. We introduce the set B_L, that corresponds to the set of sites inside the isosceles trapezoid having two sides orthogonal to $\mathbf{m}$. The trapezoid is defined in Figure 7. The set depends on a positive real number g that will be specified later and on a positive integer L. We move particles in B_L one by one, by employing a procedure which is similar to the one presented in the proof of Theorem 1.3. By "moving" we mean that we always use the instruction on the site where the particle is located until a certain "stopping" event occurs. We choose such "stopping" events and we define the order according to which we move particles in such a way that with positive probability the particle either occupies one of the sites that is empty in the initial configuration or it leaves B_L by crossing F, the boundary side of B_L which contains the origin. The general idea of the proof is that, if the density of empty sites at time 0 is less than the density of particles which either occupy one of such empty sites or leaves B_L by crossing F, then a positive density of particles must leave B_L by crossing F. We then estimate the number of particles that in particular leave B_L by crossing the origin, showing that with positive probability this is at least linear in L.

In order to describe the stabilization procedure, we introduce the sets C_g and A_K. The set C_g is defined in Figure 8 and the set A_K is defined as $A_K := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |x| < K\}$, where $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean norm. The set C_g has the property that every path starting from a site in $z \in B_L$ and entirely contained in $z + C_g$ can leave B_L only by crossing F. Furthermore, for any positive g and K large enough, a random walk starting from z is entirely contained in the set $z + A_K \cup C_g$ with positive probability. From now on, we assume that g and K are large such that such a property holds. Before defining the stabilization algorithm, we introduce some further notation. Let $\partial^0 B$ be the inner boundary of B_L on the side of F. Namely, particles in $\partial^0 B$ can leave B_L in one jump by crossing F. Moreover, we let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be the infinite line containing the segment F. Moreover, we order sites in B_L according to the following rule. Imagine that every site in B_L is intersected by a line orthogonal to $\mathbf{m}$. Then,



Figure 7: Representation of B_L in two dimensions. The isosceles trapezoid has two sides orthogonal to $\mathbf{m}$. The longest one (denoted by F) has length $4gL$ and intersects the origin, the shortest one (denoted by D) has length $2gL$. The distance between them is L. In the figure, the axis x_1' is parallel to $\mathbf{m}$ and the axis x_2' is orthogonal to x_1'.



Figure 8: The set C_g is defined as the infinite region between the two half-lines a and b starting from the origin. More precisely, let y be any positive number. The line a intersect the points $(0,0)$ and $(y, g\,y)$ and the line b intersects the points $(0,0)$ and $(y, -g\,y)$, as in the figure. The set A_K is represented by the circle.



Figure 9: Examples of particle trajectories. Filled circles on the path represent instructions "sleep" that have been used while moving the particle.

for every pair of sites belonging to distinct lines, the site which belongs to the line which is the closest to the origin must appear later in the order. The order relation among sites belonging to the same line is irrelevant.

We now describe the stabilization procedure. Consider the first site in the order, that we denote by z_1. If the site is empty *or* $d(z_1, D \cup E \cup G) \leq K$, we do nothing. Whereas, if the site hosts at least one particle *and* $d(z_1, D \cup E \cup G) > K$, we move one of these particles until one of the following events occurs.

(1) Either the particle uses an instruction "sleep" on a site in $((A_K + z_1) \setminus (C_g + z_1)) \cup \{z_1\}$ (we stop the particle in any case, even if the particle does not turn to the S-state),

(2) either the particle leaves the set $(C_g + z_1) \cup (A_K + z_1)$,

(3) either the particle reaches an empty site in the region $(C_g + z_1) \setminus \{z_1\}$,

(4) or the particle reaches one site in $\partial^0 B$.

Then, we consider the other particles on the same site and for each of them we employ the same procedure. At the next step, we consider the second site z_2 in the order we repeat the same procedure for all its particles. We proceed in this way until all particles "not too close to D, E or G" have been moved one time. Observe that, according to the previous rules, particles cannot turn to the S-state in $(C_g + z) \setminus \{z\}$, where z is the starting position of the particle. Indeed, if the particle is in $(C_g + z) \setminus \{z\}$, we use a new instruction only if the particle shares the site with an other particle. See Figure 9 as an example. In the example, the particle starting from z stops as the event (3) above occurs. The particle starting from z' stops as the event (2) occurs. Particles located on z'' are not moved, as the site is "too close" to the boundary side D.

We represent the walk of the j-th particle starting from z, that we denote by (z, j), by two sequences $\{S^{z,j}(t), Y^{z,j}(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T^{z,j}}$, where $S^{z,j}(t)$ corresponds to the site where the particle

is located and it is updated every time the particle uses a new arrow, $S^{z,j}(0) := z$ is the initial position of the particle, $Y^{z,j}(t)$ is "one" if the particle uses at least an instruction "sleep" right after the t-th arrow and "zero" otherwise, $T^{z,j}$ is the first time one among the events (1), (2), (3), or (4) occurs. By independence of instructions, $S^{z,j}(t)$ is distributed as a random walk and the probability that $Y^{z,j}(t) = 1$ is $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ for every t independently.

Let now G_L the number of particles that reach the origin before reaching any other site in $\partial^0 B_L$. Clearly, $m_{B_L,\eta,\tau}(\mathbf{0}) \geq G_L$. We show that with uniformly positive probability, G_L grows linearly with L if μ satisfies the condition in the statement of the theorem. In order to estimate G_L, we define a new process which is similar to the original one, where to each particle (z, j) in the initial configuration η we associate an infinite "sleeping random walk" $\{\tilde{S}^{z,j}(t), \tilde{Y}^{z,j}(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $\tilde{S}^{z,j}(t)$ is sampled as a random walk with the same jump distribution of the activated random walk model and for every t, $\tilde{Y}^{z,j}(t) = 1$ with probability $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ and $\tilde{Y}^{z,j}(t) = 0$ with probability $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$ independently for any t. We sample the initial configuration η the same as in the original process. Particles are moved in the same order as in the original process and every particle is moved until one of the four event listed above occurs, as in the original process. The difference with the original process is that, if the particle stops because it reaches an empty site in $(z + C_g) \setminus \{z\}$ (third event in the list) then a new particle, that we call *ghost*, appears in such a site and continues the sleeping random walk until one of the events (1), (2) or (4) occurs, without any interaction with other particles. Namely, as long as the ghost is in $(z + C_g) \setminus \{z\}$, it continuous walking without caring of the presence of empty sites until one of the following events occurs: either $\tilde{Y}(t) = 1$ when it is in $((A_L + z) \setminus (C_g + z)) \cup \{z\}$ (event 1), either it leaves $(C_g + z) \cup (A_K + z)$ (event 2), or it reaches one site in $\partial^0 B$ (event 4). When one of the events (1), (2) or (4) occurs for the ghost particle, the ghost particle disappears. If the particle (z, j) does not generate a ghost, we let $\tilde{T}^{z,j}$ be the time the particle stops, otherwise we let $\tilde{T}^{z,j}$ be the time its ghost stops.

Let now W_L the number of particles that visit the origin before any other site in $\partial^0 B$ *as a ghost or as an "original" particle.* Let R_L be the number of particles which visit the origin before any other site in $\partial^0 B$ *only as a ghost.* Then,

$$G_L \stackrel{d}{=} W_L - R_L. \tag{52}$$

The term W_L is not difficult to compute, as we don't need to take into account for the changing environment. Indeed, the particle configuration changes as new particles are moved, but this does not influence the ghosts, which do not interact with the environment. More precisely, let $\mathcal{G}^{z,j}$ be the event "the sleeping random walk $\{\tilde{S}^{z,j}(t), \tilde{Y}^{z,j}(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\tilde{S}^{z,j}(\tilde{T}^{z,j}) = \mathbf{0}$", i.e., the particle (z, j) stops at the origin as a ghost or as an "original" particle. Then,

$$W_L = \sum_{z\in B_L \,:\, d(z,D\cup E\cup G)>K} \;\sum_{1\leq j\leq \eta(z)} \mathbb{1}\left(\mathcal{G}^{z,j}\right) = \sum_{z\in B_L \,:\, d(z,D)>K} \;\sum_{1\leq j\leq \eta(z)} \mathbb{1}\left(\mathcal{G}^{z,j}\right) \tag{53}$$

where $\mathbb{1}(\,\cdot\,)$ is the indicator function. The second equality holds as, for L large enough, particles starting from z such that $d(z, E \cup G) \leq K$ cannot hit the origin, as this would be possible only by leaving $C_g + z$ (e.g. see the particle starting from z' in Figure 9). Hence, the corresponding indicator functions are all zeros. We let L be large enough such that such a property holds.

The term R_L is more difficult to handle. However, note that every ghost necessarily starts its walk from a site that is empty in the initial configuration η, due to the order according to which particles are moved, to our choice of C_g and of the events (1), (2), (3) and (4). Hence, let for every empty site a random walk start until the time it hits the inner boundary of B_L,

without any further restriction. Let $\tilde{R}_L$ the number of such walks that hit the origin before any other site that belongs to the inner boundary of B_L. Then,

$$\tilde{R}_L \overset{d}{\geq} R_L. \tag{54}$$

More precisely, denote by $X^w(t)$ be the random walk starting from the site w, let T^w be time such a random walk reaches the inner boundary of B_L and let $\mathcal{R}^w$ be the event "$X(T^w) = \mathbf{0}$". Then,

$$\tilde{R}_L = \sum_{z \in B_L \,:\, d(z,D)>K} \mathbb{1}(\eta(z) = 0) \cdot \mathbb{1}\left(\mathcal{R}^z\right). \tag{55}$$

Hence, as the events $\mathcal{G}^{z,j}$ and $\mathcal{R}^w$ are independent and as the initial configuration is distributed according to a product measure,

$$E[W_L] = \sum_{z \in B_L \,:\, d(z,D)>K} \mu \cdot P\left(\mathcal{G}^{z,1}\right), \tag{56}$$

and

$$E[\tilde{R}_L] = \sum_{z \in B_L \,:\, d(z,D)>K} \nu_0 \cdot P\left(\mathcal{R}^z\right), \tag{57}$$

where ν_0 is the probability that a site is empty.

In order to rewrite (56) and (57) as a function of L, we split the sum into different terms. Call then $\partial^1 B$ the set of sites $x \in B_L \setminus \partial^0 B$ such that there exists $y \in \partial^0 B$ such that $p(y-x) > 0$ (see for examples the squares in Figure 10). Let $x_1 \in \partial^1 B$ be the site such that $p(\mathbf{0} - x_1) > 0$ and let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be the infinite line parallel to F intersecting x_1, as in the figure. Define $\partial^2 B$, $\mathcal{F}^2$, $\partial^3 B$, $\mathcal{F}^3$ and so on similarly. Let $-\partial B^i$ be the set of elements obtained from ∂B^i by a reflection with respect to the origin, as in Figure 10 (down). Let $-\mathcal{F}_i$ be the line parallel to $\mathcal{F}_i$, intersecting $-x_i$, as in the figure. Observe that, by translation invariance, $P(\mathcal{G}^{z,1})$ equals Q^{-z}, where Q^{-z} is the probability that a sleeping random walk $\{S'(t), Y'(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ starting from the origin satisfies the next properties,

(1) $0 \leq \forall t < T'$ such that $S'(t) \in (A_K \setminus C_g) \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}, \quad \tilde{Y}'(t) = 0,$

(b) $0 \leq \forall t < T', \quad S'(t) \in C_g \cup A_K,$

(c) $S'(T') = -z.$

where T' is the first time $S'(t) \in -\partial^i B$. Hence,

$$\sum_{z \in \partial^i B} P\left(\mathcal{G}^{z,1}\right) = \sum_{z \in -\partial^i B} Q^z = F^i_{g,K}, \tag{58}$$

where $F_{g,i}$ is the probability that a sleeping random walk starting from the origin satisfies the properties (a) and (b), i.e., the walk is entirely contained in $C_g \cup A_K$ and no "ones" appear in $(A_K \setminus C_g) \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ until the walk crosses the line $-\mathcal{F}_i$. The previous relation holds as the sum is over the probability of disjoint events. We further let $F_{g,K} := \lim_{i\to\infty} F^i_{g,K}$, which is positive as a consequence of the law of large numbers. Observe also that, by translation invariance, the probability $P(\mathcal{R}^z)$ is not greater than $\tilde{Q}^{-z}$, which is defined as the probability that a random walk starting from the origin reaches the site $-z$ the step it crosses the line $-\mathcal{F}_i$ for the first time (see Figure 10 - down). Hence,

$$E[\tilde{R}_L] = \sum_{z \in \partial^i B} P\left(\mathcal{R}^z\right) \leq \sum_{z \in -\partial^i B} \tilde{Q}^z \leq 1. \tag{59}$$



Figure 10: Small circles represent the lattice sites. We assume jumps on nearest neighbours, i.e., $p(z) > 0$ iff $z \in \{(0,1),(0,-1),(1,0),(-1,0)\}$. *Up:* Representation of the sets $\partial^0 B$ (large circles), $\partial^1 B$ (squares), $\partial^2 B$ (triangles). *Down:* Representation of the sets $\partial^0 B$, $\partial^8 B$, and $-\partial^8 B$ (large circles).

The last sum is not greater than one. Indeed, the last sum would be equal to one if it was over *all* the sites where the random walk is allowed to be located the right after having crossed $-\mathcal{F}_i$ for the first time, as it hits the line $-\mathcal{F}_i$ almost surely and as the sum is over the probability of disjoint events.

Now, let d be the distance between F_i and F_{i-1}. From the considerations above, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E[W_L] &= \mu \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\max\{i\,:\,d(\mathcal{F}_i,D)\geq K\}} F^i_{K,g} \geq \mu \cdot \lfloor \frac{L}{d} \rfloor \cdot F_{g,K} - K \\ E[\tilde{R}_L] &\leq \nu_0 \cdot \lfloor \frac{L}{d} \rfloor, \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the constant K is present in the first term, as we do not move particles which have a distance less than K from the boundary side D. We further define

$$C_{K,g} := (F_{g,K} \cdot \mu - \nu_0) \cdot \frac{1}{d},$$

and we show that if $F_{g,K} \cdot \mu > \nu_0$, then the probability of the event $\{W_L - R_L < \frac{C_{K,g}}{3} L\}$ converges to 0 as $L \to \infty$. By Lemma 4, this implies that ARW stays active. Hence, by the previous inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} P(W_L - R_L < \frac{C_{K,g}}{3} L) \;\leq\; & P(W_L - R_L < \frac{E[W_L - R_L]}{3}) \\ \leq & P(W_L - E[W_L] > \frac{E[W_L - R_L]}{3}) + P(R_L - \mathbb{E}[R_L] > \frac{E[W_L - R_L]}{3}) \\ \leq & P(W_L - E[W_L] > \frac{E[W_L - R_L]}{3}) + P(\tilde{R}_L - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{R}_L] > \frac{E[W_L - R_L]}{3}) \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where P is the probability measure of the process and $E[\,\cdot\,]$ is the expectation. For the second inequality we used the union bound. We now use the Chebyshev inequality and the inequalities $Var[W_L] \leq E[W_L]$ and $Var[\tilde{R}_L] \leq E[\tilde{R}_L]$, which hold as W_L and $\tilde{R}_L$ are the sum of random variables taking values 0 or 1. Hence, from (61),

$$\begin{aligned} P(W_L - R_L < \frac{C_{L,g}}{3} L) \leq & 9 \frac{Var[W_L]}{E[W_L - R_L]^2} + 9 \frac{Var[\tilde{R}_L]}{E[W_L - R_L]^2} \\ \leq & 9 \frac{E[W_L]}{E[W_L - R_L]^2} + 9 \frac{E[\tilde{R}_L]}{E[W_L - R_L]^2} \\ \leq & \frac{18 \cdot L}{C^2_{K,g} L^2 d}. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Now observe that $F(\lambda, p(\cdot)) = \lim_{g\to\infty} \lim_{K\to\infty} F_{g,K}$, where $F(\lambda, p(\cdot))$ has been defined before the statement of the theorem. Hence, for any small ϵ and $\mu > \frac{\nu_0}{F(\lambda,p(\cdot))} + \epsilon$, we can find g and W large enough such that $C_{K,g} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2d}$. Thus, as our arguments hold for arbitrarily large g and W, we conclude that $\mu_c \leq \frac{\nu_0}{F(\lambda,p(\cdot))}$.

□

7 Concluding remarks

We shall end this article with few comments related to our work. First of all, our results show that in the case of biased jump distribution, by "stabilizing" the interval $[-L, L]$, the

expected number of visits at the origin is at least linear in L for any $\mu > \mu_1$, where μ_1 is some number $\mu_1 \geq \mu_c$. On the other hand, such a number is bounded from above by the number of visits in the case of no interaction ($\lambda = 0$), which is linear in L for any $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. Hence, it is reasonable to conjecture that $E^\nu[m_{[-L,L],\eta,\tau}(0)] = O(L)$ for any $\mu > \mu_c$.

Moreover, our results suggest that the bias of the jump distribution increases the activity in the system monotonically, i.e., that the critical density is increasing with q in $[0, 1/2)$ and decreasing with q in $[1/2, 1)$, where q is the bias parameter as in the statement of Theorem 1.1. The proof of such a monotonic behaviour of the critical density is open.

It is remarkable that the proof that $\mu_c < 1$ is still missing in the case of symmetric jump distribution, whereas an arbitrarily small bias on $\mathbb{Z}$ allows even to prove that $\mu_c \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$. Our methods do not directly generalize to the symmetric case on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. However, our methods could be employed to prove that $\mu_c < 1$ in the case of *symmetric jump distributions* on classes of graphs where the random walk has a positive speed, e.g., on a regular tree.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Artem Sapozhnikov for inspiring discussions, for suggesting an argument employed in the proof of Theorem 1.4, and for pointing out a mistake in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The author thanks Vladas Sidoravicius for inviting him to IMPA and Augusto Teixeira for fruitful discussions concerning this work. The author is grateful to Leonardo Rolla for showing how to simplify the proof of Theorem 1.3 and for very useful comments.

References

[1] E. D. Andjel: Invariant measures for the zero range processes. *Annals of Probability*, **10**, 525-547, (1982).

[2] M. Cabezas, L. T. Rolla, V. Sidoravicius: Non-equilibrium Phase Transitions: Activated Random Walks at Criticality. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **155**, 1112–1125, (2014).

[3] R. Dickman, L.T. Rolla, V. Sidoravicius: Activated Random Walkers: Facts, Conjectures and Challenges. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **138**, 126-142, (2010).

[4] K. Eriksson: Chip firing games on mutating graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math*, **9**, 118-128, (1996)

[5] O. Gurel-Gurevich, G. Amir: On Fixation of Activated Random Walks. *Electronic communications in Probability*, **15**, Art 12, (2009).

[6] C. Hoffman and V. Sidoravicius: unpublished (2004). The result can be found in [2, Proposition 1].

[7] L. T. Rolla and V. Sidoravicius: Absorbing-State Phase Transition for Driven-Dissipative Stochastic Dynamics on $\mathbb{Z}$. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, **188**, 1, 127-150, (2012).

[8] E. Shellef: Nonfixation for activated random walk. *Alea*, **7**, 137-149, (2010).

[9] V. Sidoravicius and A. Teixeira: Absorbing-state transitions for Stochastic Sandpiles and Activated Random Walk. *ArXiv:* 1412.7098, (2014).